

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 24 2007

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030523US1
Serial No. 10/617,526
Response to Office Action mailed January 24, 2007

III. REMARKS

1. Double Patenting. Claims 1-58 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 10/617,530, in view of <http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/>, Chinese-English Dictionary link.

Applicant responds that the provisional rejection is either premature as the claims have not been finalized, or that the rejection has been overcome by the amended claims.

2. Claims 1-3, 8-11, 16-17, 23-24, 29-32, 37-40, 45-46, 52-53, and 58 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5-7, 26, 30-32 of copending Application No. 10/631,070.

Applicant responds that the provisional rejection is either premature as the claims have not been finalized, or that the rejection has been overcome by the amended claims.

3. Claim rejections 35 USC 112.

In regard to claims 18 and 47, applicant has amended the claims to overcome the rejection. In regard to claims 23 and 52, the rejection is moot as the claims have been canceled. In regard to claims 30-58, the examiner stated that the phrases "program product" and "computer-usable medium" were not defined in the specification. Applicant has amended the specification to add "[p]ersons skilled in the art are aware that a computer program such as TP

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030523US1
Serial No. 10/617,526
Response to Office Action mailed January 24, 2007

200 can be embodied as a program product on a computer-usable medium such as a removable disk or a CD-ROM or as a download to a computer storage such as Memory 100."

4. Claim rejections 35 USC 101(a).

The examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-22, 24-28, 30-36, 38-44, 46-51, and 53-57 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the rejection.

5. Claim rejections 35 USC 101(a).

The examiner rejected claims 30-58 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the rejections.

6. Claim rejections 35 USC 102(b).

The examiner rejected claims 17-20, 22-23, 46-49, 51-52 as being anticipated by Chinese-English Dictionary

<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/>

The web site referenced by the examiner does not provide a display in response to an activation of a single control as recited in each of the amended independent claims. Support for the amendment is found in the specification paragraph beginning on page 13, lines 5-11. Specifically, "[s]ubmit button 304 instructs TP 200 to analyze the character in the user input field 302" and "TP200 displays the Simplified Chinese character 306, the Traditional Chinese character equivalent 308, the properly accented Pin Yin 310, and the English translation 312

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030523US1
Serial No. 10/617,526
Response to Office Action mailed January 24, 2007

below user input field 302." Mandarintools, on the other hand requires several clicks, or the activation of several controls, before a result can be obtained. On page 1 of the Chinese-English Dictionary graphical user interface, Mandarintools requires entry of the search term and selection from menus in three additional windows before activating the "Look It UP!" button. The four windows are "Search," "as," "Output as," and "Look for." In contrast, applicant's translation tool performs the task in one step with the identification of the input character type taking place automatically. Therefore, applicant's claimed invention eliminates steps for the user and distinguishes over Mandarintools.

5. Claim rejections 35 USC 103(a).

The examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-16, 24-26, 28-33, 35-41, 43-45, 53-55, and 57-58 as being unpatentable over Chinese-English Dictionary

<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/> in view of Foolsworkshop

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20021206035901/http://www.foolsworkshop.com/ptou/>).

Applicant distinguishes over Mandarintools and Foolsworkshop for the reasons set forth above in paragraph 4.

6. Claim rejections 35 USC 103(a).

The examiner rejected claims 5, 13, 27, 34, 42, and 56 as being unpatentable over Chinese-English Dictionary

<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/> in view of Foolsworkshop

Attorney Docket No. AUS920030523US1
Serial No. 10/617,526
Response to Office Action mailed January 24, 2007

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20021206035901/http://www.foolsworkshop.com/ptou/>) and in further view of Hughes ("ICT3 Computer Science Sampler Paper", 1998, University of Dublin)

Applicant distinguishes over Mandarintoos!, Foolsworkshop, and Hughes for the reasons set forth in paragraph 4 above.



Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2650
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-461-4703
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com